



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,720	04/15/2004	Bradford L. Bjorklund	108192	6707

23490 7590 02/22/2007
HONEYWELL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY INC
PATENT SERVICES
101 COLUMBIA DRIVE
P O BOX 2245 MAIL STOP AB/2B
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TAM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1764

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,720

Applicant(s)

BJORKLUND ET AL.

Examiner

Tam M. Nguyen

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/15/04, 4/28/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-10 and 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beech Jr. et al. (U.S. 7,119,241 B2).

Beech discloses a process for removing catalyst fines from an effluent stream in an oxygenate- to-olefin (OTO) process. An oxygenate stream (e.g., methanol) is contacted with a catalyst comprising a molecular sieve catalyst (e.g., SAPO) in a fast-fluidized bed reactor system comprising cyclones to separate a production mixture into a stream of deactivate catalyst particles and a product effluent comprising light olefins, unreacted oxygenates, H₂O and contaminating catalyst particles. The reactor system is operated at a temperature of from 350° C to 550° C, so the product effluent exited the reactor system would have a temperature within 350° C to 550° C. The effluent is then cooled by heat exchanger before charging into a quenching zone (scrubbing) to produce a liquid bottom stream containing contaminating catalyst particles and liquid medium (e.g., water) and an overhead stream containing light olefins. The stream of deactivate catalyst is then passed into a regeneration zone and therein contacting with an oxidizing gas stream to produce regenerated catalyst particles. At least a portion of the liquid

Art Unit: 1764

bottom stream is then passed into the regeneration zone. It is optional to concentrate fines catalyst from the liquid bottom stream before being sent to the regeneration zone. Beech teaches that the molecular sieve catalyst composition is described in U.S. Patent No. 6,137,022 is herein fully incorporated and the U.S. Patent No. 6,137,022 teaches the use of SAPO-34 in the OTO process. Since the quench device bottoms temperature is from 82° C to 149° C, it would be expected that the bottom liquid would have a temperature of from 82° C to 149° C. It is noted that Beech does not specifically teach that the contaminating catalyst containing coke deposits in an amount sufficient to prevent any substantial damage to their catalytic activity when they are exposed to the hydrothermal shock of the quenching step or the regenerating step. However contaminating catalyst of Beech is produced in the same way as the claimed contaminating catalyst, it would be expected that the contaminating catalyst of Beech would contain a similar amount of coke deposits. (See entire patent)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1764

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Beech Jr. et al. (U.S. 7,119,241 B2) in view of Ding et al. (7,135,604 B2)

The process of Beech is as discussed above.

Beech does not disclose that the medium contains water and alkaline reagent.

Ding teaches an OTO process wherein a medium contains water and an alkaline. See abstract; col. 2, lines 38-46.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Beech by adding alkaline to water as taught by Ding because alkaline will enhance the separation of carbon dioxide. Consequently, the medium containing alkaline would be capable to neutralize any acidic-by product as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tam M. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 1764

TN

